



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*v. Phillips*, 44 Iowa 353. The tendency of the law is towards the ruling of this court. *Taylor v. Webb*, 54 Miss. 42; *Laughton v. Harden*, 68 Me. 208.

INSOLVENCY—PREFERENCES—RIGHTS OF CREDITORS.—POWERS—TAYLOR DRUG CO. *v.* FAULCONER ET AL., 44 S. E. 204 (W. VA.).—An insolvent debtor, with intent to prefer certain of his creditors, sold his property to a third party who was cognizant of the facts. The proceeds of the sale were paid to the preferred creditors. *Held*, that such sale was not fraudulent in fact. An intent to prefer is insufficient to establish a fraudulent intent. McWhorter, P., and Dent, J., *dissenting*.

There is a distinction between the effect of a transfer by a debtor in failing circumstances and an intent to hinder, delay or defraud his creditors. If the intent is to defraud, a valuable consideration will not save the transfer. *Gans v. Renshaw*, 2 Barr (Pa.) 36. The statute of 13 Eliz. is aimed only at intended fraud. *Bank v. Carter*, 38 Pa. 453. Without clear proof of fraud the sale is valid. *Meade v. Smith*, 16 Conn. 346; *Kirkland v. Snow*, 20 Conn. 23. The burden of proof rests upon the creditor impeaching the preference. *Glen v. Grover*, 3 Md. 212; *Johnson v. McGrew*, 11 Iowa 151. The fact that the debtor was about to abscond was held in *Garr v. Hill*, 9 N. J. Eq. 210, not to invalidate the sale. A secret motive for preference is immaterial, *Bun v. Ahl*, 21 Pa. 387, but the law will not tolerate any form of trust to the benefit of the debtor. *Johnson v. Whitwell*, 24 Mass. 71; *Dalton v. Currier*, 40 N. H. 237. If the debtor contrives that other creditors shall never be paid this is not a *bona fide* preference and the transfer may be set aside. *Drury v. Cross*, 7 Wall. 299; *James v. Ry. Co.*, 6 Wall. 752; *Gorden v. Clapp*, 113 Mass. 335; *Smith v. Schwed*, 9 Fed. 483.

JUDGMENT—WANT OF JURISDICTION—SERVICE OBTAINED BY TRICK.—FRAWLEY, BUNDY & WILCOX *v.* CASUALTY CO., 124 FED. 259.—*Held*, that a service of summons obtained by fraud is invalid and the defendant is not bound by a judgment rendered thereon.

Service obtained by fraud is invalid. *Williams v. Reed*, 29 N. J. L. 385. And the one upon whom it is made may have an action therefor. *Wanger v. Bright*, 52 Ill. 35. But it would seem that, if the service is in behalf of one not a party to a fraud, it will be good. *Nichols & Co. v. Goodheart*, 5 Ill. Ap. 574; *Adrianse v. La Grave*, 59 N. Y. 110; though the principle of this ruling is doubted. *Alderson, Jud. Writs*, 272. But if the one upon whom the fraudulent service is made enters a plea, the irregularity is waived, *Manhard v. Schott*, 37 Mich. 234; *Gilson v. Powers*, 16 Ill. 355; even though a motion to dismiss the suit has been made and overruled. *Peters v. R. Co.*, 59 Mo. 406; *Gorner v. Slate*, 8 Blackf. 567. If judgment goes against the plaintiff by default, some cases hold that it cannot be collaterally attacked. *Shee v. La Grange*, 78 Iowa 101; *McMullen v. State*, 105 Ind. 334. Other courts, when suit is brought on the judgment, treat it as void. *Wood v. Wood*, 78 Ky. 624; *Dunlap & Co. v. Cody*, 31 Iowa 260. And this better accords with the rule that the judgment of a court which has no jurisdiction is void. 1 *Black, Jud.*, 218.

MASTER AND SERVANT—BLACKLIST—BOYER *v.* WESTERN UNION TEL. CO., 124 FED. 246.—*Held*, that an employer, having discharged employes for belonging to a labor union, has the right to enter the reason of their discharge